

REMARKS

Claims 1-6, 8-12 and 19-23 are pending in this application with claims 1-3 and 19 being independent. Claim 3 has been amended to correct a minor grammatical error. No new matter has been introduced.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 19, 20 and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over European Patent Number 1,204,087 A1 (“Tokimoto”) in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,965,361 (“Sheats”). Claims 2-6, 8-12, 21 and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Publication Number 2003/0117348 (“Knapp”) in view of Sheats. The following remarks address each of these rejections in turn.

A. Rejection of independent claims 1 and 19, and their dependent claims.

Claims 1, 19, 20 and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Tokimoto in view of Sheats. Applicants traverse this rejection.

Independent claim 1 recites a display device that includes a pixel comprising first to n-th light-emitting elements that emit different emission colors. The first to n-th light emitting elements are laminated and each of the first to n-th light-emitting elements emits light in a field sequential driving format, where n is a natural number, $2 \leq n$.

Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 because Tokimoto and Sheats, either alone or in combination, fail to describe or suggest at least that the first to n-th light emitting elements are laminated, where n is a natural number greater than or equal to 2, as recited in claim 1.

The rejection concedes that Tokimoto fails to teach that the first to n-th light emitting elements are laminated and relies on Sheats as showing this feature. However, Sheats is equally deficient.

Sheats relates to a display device using organic electroluminescent materials. Sheats at col. 1, lines 5-9. The display device includes light emitting pixels, with each pixel including a transistor, a driving circuit, and an organic light emitting diode (“OLED”). Sheats at Abstract.

FIG. 4 of Sheats illustrates a cross-sectional view of the portion of display (80) containing a single pixel. Sheats at col. 4, lines 37-39. As shown in FIG. 4 and described in column 4, lines 44-46, the pixel includes only a single OLED laminated on its transistor (71) and not a plurality of OLEDs laminated on its transistor (71), as recited in claim 1 and shown in FIG. 12 of the present application.

Accordingly, Sheats fails to describe or suggest that two or more light emitting elements are laminated, as recited in claim 1. For at least these reasons, applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 and its dependent claim 20.

Independent claim 19 recites a driving method of a display device that includes two or more laminated light emitting elements. Therefore, for at least the reasons presented above with respect to claim 1, applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 19 and its dependent claim 23.

B. Rejection of independent claims 2 and 3, and their dependent claims.

Claims 2-6, 8-12, 21 and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Knapp in view of Sheats. Applicants traverse this rejection.

Similar to the independent claim 1, independent claim 2 recites a display device that includes, among other features, a lamination of two or more light-emitting layers and three or more pixel electrodes.

Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 2 because Knapp and Sheats, either alone or in combination, fail to describe or suggest a lamination of two or more light-emitting layers and three or more pixel electrodes, as recited in claim 2. The rejection concedes that Knapp fails to show this feature, and relies on Sheats as doing so. However, as pointed out above with respect to claim 1, Sheats does not describe or suggest a laminated arrangement of two or more light-emitting layers. Accordingly, applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 2 and its dependent claims 8 and 21.

Furthermore, claim 2 also recites, among other features, that each pixel includes first to n-th current supply lines, another feature that is not taught by Knapp and Sheats. In particular, claim 2 recites, among other features, "first to n-th current supply lines...and the m-th pixel electrode [among the first to (n+1)th pixel electrodes that are laminated] is electrically connected

to the m-th current supply line, [where] n is a natural number, $2 \leq n$, and m is a natural number, $1 \leq m \leq n$.”

To show that Knapp teaches the first to n-th current supply lines, the rejection relies on FIG. 4 of Knapp. In particular, the rejection asserts that the control lines (23) are the current supply lines. Applicants disagree. The control lines (23), as apparent from their name and as described in paragraph [0065], provide control signals for controlling the current flow through the display elements (11a-11c) by controlling the gate voltage of transistors (22). The current which passes through the display elements (11a-11c) is supplied from the power line (13). Indeed, applicants submit that the control lines (23) cannot supply current to the display elements (11a-11c) because of an insulator located between the gate electrode and source and drain electrodes of the transistor (22).

For the forgoing reasons, applicants submit that the only current supply line that is described by Knapp is the *single* power line (13). As such, Knapp fails to describe or suggest that each pixel includes first to n-th current supply lines. Sheats similarly fails to describe or suggest this feature. In particular and as shown in FIG. 15 of Sheats, each of the pixels (20, 25, 30, and 35) in the display device (10) includes a *single* current supply line (15).

For at least these additional reasons, applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 2 and its dependent claims 8 and 21.

Independent claim 3 recites features similar to the above-recited features of claim 2. Therefore, for at least the reasons presented above with respect to claim 2, applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 3 and its dependent claims 4-6, 9-12 and 22.

Conclusion

It is believed that all of the pending issues have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this reply should be construed as an intent to

Applicant : Yoshifumi Tanada et al.
Serial No. : 10/717,970
Filed : November 21, 2003
Page : 10 of 10

Attorney's Docket No.: 12732-178001 / US6774

concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this reply, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

The fee in the amount of \$120 for a one-month extension of time is being paid concurrently herewith on the Electronic Filing System (EFS) by way of Deposit Account authorization. Please apply any other charges or credits to Deposit Account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,



Date: March 15, 2007

John F. Hayden
Reg. No. 37,640

Customer No. 26171
Fish & Richardson P.C.
1425 K Street, N.W., 11th Floor
Washington, DC 20005-3500
Telephone: (202) 783-5070
Facsimile: (202) 783-2331